



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The which is space begun
 . . . lies in Heaven, across the flood
 Of ether, as a bridge.

Whether or not we admit direct verbal borrowing here—and I think the probability in some of the cases cited is very strong—it is evident that Rossetti's central idea is found highly developed in Bailey, and moreover that both poets use on occasion the same kind of cosmic imagery, visualize the interstellar spaces in much the same way. In Rossetti there is indeed a decorative use of religious imagery which is not found in Bailey, and also a studied curiousness and simplicity which is utterly alien to Bailey's turgid and grandiose style. *The Blessed Damsel* is invincibly original, and nothing that has been said here should be construed to mean that Rossetti's poem is not worth all the forty thousand lines of *Festus* put together. But it seems clear to probation, I think, that even though *The Raven* gave Rossetti the initial suggestion for the poem, and even though his Italian background gave him a certain amount of detail, his enthusiastic study of *Festus* markedly influenced his formulation of the central idea and the imagery by which he developed it.

ALAN D. MCKILLOP.

Trinity College.

AD IMPRIMENDUM SOLUM

Before the evolution of a definite system of allowance of publication of books in England, and of a method of recording copyright in the registers of the Stationers' Company of London, it was customary to secure for certain works royal grants, or patents. It has been assumed that these were both allowances for publication and guarantees for the exclusive enjoyment of a property. The possession of such a patent was, in the early sixteenth century, frequently announced by the printing of the whole patent or, more commonly, a portion sufficient to show that a particular sort of royal privilege had been granted *ad imprimendum solum*. This phrase, so frequently met with in early sixteenth century books, has usually been taken to indicate a sole, or exclusive, printing right, But Mr. Alfred W. Pollard has recently proposed a new interpreta-

tion, based upon a passage from the proclamation of Henry VIII, for the bringing in of seditious books, Nov. 16, 1538:

"Item that no persone or persons in this realme, shall from hensforth print any boke in the englyshe tonge, onles upon examination made by some of his gracis priuie counsayle, or other suche as his highnes shall appoynte, they shall haue lycence so to do, and yet so hauynge, not to put these wordes *Cum priuilegio regali*, without addyng *ad imprimendum solum*, and that the hole copie, or els at the least theeffect of his licence and priuilege be therwith printed, and playnely declared and expressed in the Englyshe tonge underneth them."

Mr. Pollard remarks on this:

"Incidentally we may note that while a distinction appears to be drawn between a license and a privilege, the one word 'privilegium' seems to be used as a Latin equivalent for both. Every book, as I understand the proclamation, required a license; but this license was not to be paraded by the use of the words 'Cum priuilegio' without these words being limited and restricted by the addition 'ad imprimendum.' These must, therefore, be construed 'only for printing,' *i. e.*, not for protection, unless this was expressly stated, in which case the 'licence' was raised to the higher rank of a 'privilege.' The words 'ad imprimendum solum' have been generally interpreted as equivalent to 'for sole, or exclusive, printing.' Whether or not they can legitimately bear this meaning in Tudor Latin is perhaps doubtful. It seems quite clear from this Proclamation that this is not the meaning they were intended to bear; but so far from the Proclamation in this respect attaining its end, it seems pretty certain that it intensified the very misconception which its authors tried to remove."¹

I cannot agree with Mr. Pollard in his innovation, because I see nothing in the proclamation to warrant such an interpretation, and because his reading makes nonsense of the royal patents themselves, as we shall see in several examples. I cannot find an instance where the phrase seems to me to mean "only for printing" rather than "for printing *sole*," which is, I believe, the natural interpretation of the words, as based on their use. Tudor Latin has stranger constructions by far than *ad imprimendum solum* as

¹ "Regulation of the Book-trade . . .," *Library*, Ser. 3, No. 25, Vol. VII, pp. 22-24.

meaning for *printing sole*, i. e., to the exclusion of all others from a similar right to print the work in question. This is certainly, as Mr. Pollard himself admits, the use of the phrase made by Shakespeare in Biondello's speech, *Taming of the Shrew*, iv, iv, 93. And we need not suppose that the proclamation of 1538 intensified a misconception in this direction or that it tried to cure one. The Proclamation did fail of its purpose in that the directions for the addition of the phrase *ad imprimendum solum* and of the summary of the privilege were not at all uniformly carried out. But I do not believe it was ever intended to make the phrase mean "only for printing and not for protection." If there is any notion of "only for printing," it must mean only for printing or publication in the first place, with rights reserved to recall in case, after publication, it should be discovered that any treasonable, seditious, or heretical matter should be found to have been overlooked when the work was allowed or *to have crept in after the allowance*. In other words, I think that Mr. Pollard's quotation from the proclamation lends itself to his new theory only because he has, in his efforts to throw light on a single puzzling passage, practically stripped it of context. If one begins with the somewhat tedious preamble, the passage fits into the general purpose of the whole proclamation, to safeguard the realm by reserving rights to suppress objectionable matter whether or not a work succeeded in getting by the licensers; and to prevent the surreptitious insertion of offensive matter after allowance:

"The kings moost royall maiestie being enformed that sundry contentions and synistre opinions hath by wrong teachyng and nawghty printed boks incresyd and growen wt in this his realme of England and other his domynyons amongs his loving subjects of the same contrary to the true faythe, reverence, and due observation of such sacraments and sacramentals and laudable rites, ceremonies, as heretofore have been used and accustomed within the Churche of England, whereof his hieghnes immedyately, under God is iustely and lauffully soverayn, chefe and supreme hedd in erthe immedyately under Christ Estimyng also that by occasion of sundry prynted bookes in Englishe tonge as be brought from outward partes and by such like books as have been prented within this his realme sett forth wt priviledge conteyning annotacions and additions in the margines, prologs, and calendars, imagyned and invented by the makers dyvisers and printers of the same books, as by sundry

strange persones called Anabaptists and Sacramentarys which be lately comen into this realme where some of them remayn privily unknowen. And by some other his hieghnes subjects using som superstitious speches and rashe words of erroneous matters, and fantastickall opinyons bothe in their prechings and famylyar communications wherby dyverse and many of his simple loving subjects have ben enduced and encoraged arrogantly and supersticyosly to argue and dispute in open places tavernes and alehouses not wonly uppon baptysme but allso uppon the holy and blessed sacrament of the aultre," etc.

The reprint in Strype's *Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer*, II, 256, from the ms. in the British Museum (Cleopatra E, v., 321) shows by italics "several corrections and additions in the handwriting of Henry VIII." Among the italicised passages is the one Mr. Pollard is explaining:

"Item that no person or persones in this realm shall from hensforth printe any books in the Englishe tonge *onles* uppon examynacion made by some of his grac's pryve counsaile or other such as his hieghnes shall appoint, *they shall have lycence so to do and yet so havyng nott to put thes words cum privilegio regali wt ought addyng ad imprimendum solum.* And that the hole copie or ells at the lest theeffect of his licence and privilege be therew t printed and playnly declared and expressed in the Englishe tonge vnderneath them nor from hensforth shall print or bring into this his realme any boks of dyvyn scripture in the English tong w t any annotacions in the margyn or any prologs or addytions in the calendar *or table* except such annotacions be first vieued examyned and allowed by the kings hieghnes or such of his counsaile or other as it shall please his maiestie to assigne therto," etc.

Now, reading this over and considering the corrections and additions, we recognize the first, *onles*, as merely a necessary correction of an omission occasioned by failure to remember that the item began with a negative. The second, like the third, seems to be an effort to interpret more strictly what immediately follows or precedes. The passage makes good sense without the second addition; but the second addition read after what follows, "And that the whole copy . . . of his licence," etc., seems to be to provide against a deceptive garbling of the royal privilege to make it seem to be a larger protection of a work than a mere protection of exclusive printing rights, such as, for example, a protection against

recall and suppression. If the reader will take the time to read the whole proclamation, I believe he will agree with me that this is not a forced interpretation.

As I have already suggested, it would probably not trouble a Tudor scholar to translate *ad imprimendum solum* as *for printing sole*. This quasi-adverbial use must have been familiar enough in English legal parlance not to seem strange in the kind of Latin then in use. The New English Dictionary lists (388) several examples of the meaning "with no other person or persons, without participator, partner, sharer, especially in rights, duties, or possessions":

1450. *Rolls of Parlt.* v, 190-1. Eny thing by us to hym graunted soule, or by us graunted to hym and eny other person or persons joyntly with hym.

1477. *Ibid.*, vi, 194-2. Every other persone to whose use the said Duke is sole seised in eny Castelles.

1596. W. Barlow, *Third Sermon*. II, 49. The intollerable licenses of Monopoles and Solesales. (The construction of this is not in point, but the meaning is decidedly so.)

1621. *Elsing Lord's Deb.* (Camden) App. 153. The privilege of the sole printing of the Bible.²

If we turn now to the privileges as listed in Rymer's *Foedera*, we see indubitable evidence that the privileges were granted to guarantee exclusive printing rights to the owner, that he might reap financial benefits from the work. "Sole printing" does not occur in all, but it occurs in many of these privileges. Where it does not, there is an equivalent.

Palsgrave's seven year privilege, printed in the 1530 Folio of *Lesclarcissement de la Langue Francoyse*, does not contain the phrase in question, but, like other privileges, charges and commands all subjects that none print or cause to be printed any books after the copy of this work.

Thomas Cooper's privilege for *Bibliotheca Eliota*, 12 Mar. 1563 (Rymer, xv, 628) reads:

"We therefore of our Grace especiall and mere Mocion, have licenced and privileged, and, by these Presentes, do graunte and gyve Lycence and Priviledge, unto the said Thos. Cooper and his

² Cf. the use of "sole printing" as granted by letters patents in the Statute of 21 Jac. 1 (Rymer, *Foedera*, xvii, 522).

Assignes onlye, to prynte, and set fourthe to sale the said *English Dictionarye* (before tyme name *Bibliotheca Eliota*) . . .”

A characteristic form of grant for the age of Elizabeth is that of the rights in *Tacitus* to Richard Wright, 1591 (33 Eliz., p. 17, m²):

“Knowe ye that We . . . doe graunte and give Licence and Priviledge unto . . . Richard Wrighte of Oxford and his Assignes onlye, duringe the naturall Lyfe of the said Ricarde Wrighte, to imprinte or cause to be imprinted the Hystorie of Cornelius Tacitus, straightlie inhibitinge and forbidding all and everye other Person and Persons whatsoever, aswell our Subjects as Straungers, that they or anye of them, . . . do not . . . printe . . . the said Historie. . . .”

Fynes Morrison got a privilege not only for sole printing but also for sole selling of a work in 1617 (Rymer, xvii, 10-11):

“Know ye that We . . . give and grant full and sole Privilege and Licence and Authoritie unto our well beloved Subjects Fynes Morrison Gentleman his Executors, etc. . . . for . . . one and twenty years . . . to imprynt, or cause to be imprynted, and to sell utter convert assign and dispose . . . to his . . . best Benefit and advantage, the Booke and Books called an *Itinerary* written by the said Fynes Morrison.” As one or two parts were not yet finished, the allowance was provisional: “being first seene viewed & allowed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bp. of London or by one of them.” This shows the relation between allowance and privilege very clearly. It comes out still more clearly in the privilege of Caleb Morley, 9 Mar., 1626 (Rymer, xviii, 857-60):

“. . . That, by his paynfull Studies and greate Chardges, by the Space of Twenty Yeares and upwards, he hath invented a Method for the firme and infallible Helpe of Memorie, and grounding of Schollers in severall Languages . . . and that the said method, being lycenced to be printed, hath beene approved by three Reverend Doctors, and therefore hath humbly besought us in Recompence of his paynfull Study and great Charges, that We would be graciously pleased to grant him Our Letters Patents of Priviledge, under Our Greate Seale of England for Twenty and One Yeares for the sole printing, venting, and selling of his owne Labours.”

George Sandis secured a privilege for the “sole printing” of a

translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, 24 April, 1626 (Rymer, xviii, 676).

Joseph Webb secured a very exclusive privilege for a way to teach speaking and writing of languages 26 April, 1626 (Rymer, xviii, 680): "Letters Patents of Privilege, as well for the sole Teaching by himselfe or Substitutes, the Writing and Speaking the said Tongues, by the Way & Method by him inuented, as for the Sole Selling and Printing of suche Bookes, as are or shall be of his Invention, or by him made serviceable and conducing to that end."

In view of the nature of these privileges, the reader will no doubt agree that if we interpret *ad imprimendum solum* in any way which robs the privilege of exclusiveness, we have made the royal privilege a mockery. Exclusive right in a property was the fundamental aim in seeking a patent. The patent might protect a natural right more powerfully or create an artificial right, as is illustrated in printing: where the author's own right in his work is protected (or that of his chosen printer); or where a printer is given the right to a whole field of work, thus creating a monopoly.

Some light may be thrown upon this question by considering a law case in which the argument turns upon the absence of the *sole* in a grant of printing rights in the Psalms. It appears, in *Stationers v. Oxford*, 4 Jac. 2, B. R. (Shower, I, 671 ff.) that the Stationers had had granted to them *plenam potestatem privilegium et licentiam imprimendi*. Serjeant Holt, defending the Oxford stationers, raises the interesting legal quibble whether "full power," with a prohibition of others' printing, is identical with sole privilege of printing a certain thing.

"By the words of the patent he gives them power to print &c with a prohibition to all others. Now the question is, whether this vests a sole interest or no? The king grants to them—the words are a grant of "*officium impressoris* of all books. Theirs is of several in particular, with a prohibition to all others not to print:—licence and liberty, &c.

"Those words in the case of a subject make not a grant to be sole: as if I grant to a man *plenam licentiam et libertatem piscandi*, this doth not amount to a sole grant, but ought to have the words *several fishery*. . . . So that, if it was the intention of the king to have granted the sole licence and liberty of printing, there ought to have been apt words put into the patent. For if in the case of a subject before mentioned, the grant of a common is not sole, with-

out special words; *a fortiori* in the case of the king, whose grants are interpreted more strictly and in which grants nothing passes without express words. And as to the words of prohibition of all others to print &c. these words cannot amount to a grant, neither can anything pass thereby."

The course of the argument was, that the prohibition ended with the king's death and did not vest an interest in the grantee. The court inclined for the defendants, says Skinner. This is what one would expect at a time when monopolies were so much opposed. The argument above shows clearly that the attorney construed the "sole" as vesting *exclusive* rights in the grantee, *i. e.*, as vesting in him an interest in an exclusive property right.³

EVELYN MAY ALBRIGHT.

University of Chicago.

REVIEWS

Materials and Methods of Fiction, Revised and Enlarged. By CLAYTON HAMILTON. New York: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1918. Pp. xxvi + 233.

In revising his well known manual, mainly by the addition of review questions, sectional "heads," and a few deprecatory remarks about O. Henry, Mr. Clayton Hamilton has effected little alteration in the original. By a clever publisher's trick, however, the new edition has been put forth under two titles, both as given above and as *A Manual of the Art of Fiction, Prepared for the Use of Schools and Colleges*; but prospective purchasers should be warned that the two apparently distinct works differ only in the title page and in the wording of one sentence in the "Foreword."

During the ten years that have elapsed since the *Materials and Methods of Fiction* was first published it has become a standard work. In spite of the many competitors which the decade has brought into the overcrowded field of textbooks for story writers, it remains perhaps the most thoughtful and the most genuinely

³ Since this article went to press, Mr. Pollard has informed me of the intended publication of an investigation by Mr. A. W. Reed, who presented a paper on this subject before the Bibliographical Society of London in November.